DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 043 090 24 CG 005 926

AUTHOR	Rossi, Peter H.
TITLE	Community Social Indicators.
INSTITUTION	Johns Hopkins Univ., Baltimore, Md. Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	R-85
BUREAU NO	BR-6-1610
PUB DATE	Oct 70
GRANT	OEG-27-061610-0207
NOTE	85p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.35
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Characteristics, *Community Planning, Family (Sociological Unit), Institutions, Population Distribution, *Residential Patterns, *Social Factors, *Social Influences, Social Psychology, Social Relations

ABSTRACT

This paper develops a conceptual scheme which takes the global conception of community and breaks it down into important components. Existing definitions of community tend to confuse two very different classes of social relations, symbiotic and commensalistic, a very clear differentiation being made between the two in the paper. The paper proposes that researchers use the concept of residential locality, defined as arbitrary geographical areas inhabited by households, persons, and institutions. Several important ways of characterizing residential localities are presented, each leading to researches which would assess the effects of living in particularly residential localities upon those who have their addresses in those places. In addition to specifying meaningful dimensions of residential localities, the author suggests operational forms of each dimension and discusses some of the measurement problems which may arise. The conceptual framework plus the operational forms provide ways of designing empirical studies which would sort out the effects of residential localities from other contingent factors. (KJ/Author)

ED043090

BR 6-1610
PA 24
CG

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF SOCIAL ORGANIZATION OF SCHOOLS

REPORT No. 85

COMMUNITY SOCIAL INDICATORS

PETER H. ROSSI

CG 005 926

OCTOBER, 1970

STAFF

John L. Holland, Director

James M. McPartland, Assistant Director

Virginia Bailey

Thelma L. Baldwin

Zahava D. Blum

Judith P. Clark

James S. Coleman

Robert L. Crain

David DeVries

Keith J. Edwards

Doris R. Entwisle

Gail M. Fennessey

James Fennessey

Catherine J. Garvey

Ellen Greenberger

Rubie J. Harris

Edward J. Harnch

Robert T. Hogan

John H. Hollifield

Michael Inbar

Nancy L. Karweit

Judith A. Kennedy

Steven J. Kidder

Hao-Mei Kuo

Samuel A. Livingston

Edward L. McDill

Rebecca J. Muraro

Jeanne I. O'Connor

Nancy A. Rigby

Martha O. Roseman

Peter H. Rossi

Leslie B. Schnuelle

Aage B. Sørensen

Annemette Sørensen

Julian C. Stanley

Keith F. Taylor

Mary C. Viernstein

Murray A. Webster

Diana F. Ward

Barbara J. Williams

Phyllis K. Wilson

EDO 43090

COMMUNITY SOCIAL INDICATORS

Program No. BR61610-02-04

Grant OEG-27-061610-0207

Report No. 85

Peter H. Rossi

October, 1970

A revision of a paper originally prepared for a projected volume on social psychological indicators to be edited by Angus Campbell and Phillip E. Converse.

Published by the Center for Social Organization of Schools, supported in part as a research and development center by funds from the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the Office of Education should be inferred.

The Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, Maryland

ABSTRACT

Although social scientists and laymen alike believe that place of residence affects the well being of households and individuals, there has been very little in the way of empirical research demonstrating either the existence of a "community effect" or assessing its strength, magnitude and direction. This paper aspires to be a step toward planning research bearing on this central issue in the study of local communities.

The paper develops a conceptual scheme which takes the global conception of community and breaks it down into important components. Existing definitions of community tend to confuse two very different classes of social relations, symbiotic and commensalistic, a very clear differentiation being made between the two in the paper. The paper proposes that researchers use the concept of residential locality, defined as arbitrary geographical areas inhabited by households, persons and institutions. Several important ways of characterizing residential localities are presented in the paper each leading to researches which would assess the effects of living in particularly residential localities upon those who have their addresses in those places.

In addition to specifying meaningful dimensions of residential localities, the author suggests operational forms of each dimension and discusses some of the measurement problems which may arise. The conceptual framework plus the operationalized forms provide ways of designing empirical studies which would sort out the effects of residential localities from other contingent factors. In addition, the conceptual framework leads to a set of social psychological indicators designed to measure the important qualities of life, as such qualities may be reflected in residential localities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper arose out of the work of Program II "Social Accounts." A number of my colleagues have contributed their ideas to this paper. It is a pleasure to acknowledge the help of James S. Coleman, Mark S. Granovetter, Richard Berk, W. Eugene Groves, Bettye K. Eidson, and David Boesel, all of whom took the time to read the original version of the paper and to criticize its shortcomings.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract i

Acknowledgements ii

Table of Contents. iii

I. Introduction. 1

II. Conceptions of "Community" 8

III. Some Social Psychological Problems in the Measurement of "Community". 22

IV. Appropriate Research Design Strategies 28

V. Social Psychological "Community" Indicators . .35

A. Orientations to Localities as Collectivities 36

B. Interaction and Exchange: The Measurement of Integration. 51

C. Relationships to Central Local Institutions 61

D. Social Psychological Aspects of Housing. 67

VI. A Strategy for Community Social Indicators . .75

I. Introduction

The world has become increasingly cosmopolitan: but the daily lives of most people and most of the daily lives of almost everyone are contained within local communities. Europe is only a few hours from the East Coast by fast jet; yet only a very small proportion of Americans have visited Europe. Indeed, the majority of Americans have yet to take their first airplane trip within the United States. One in five Americans changes residence each year, but the typical move is but a few miles.* One out of three Americans have never traveled more than two hundred miles from their birthplaces and a majority are still living in the states in which they were born.

Even for those proportionately few who have migrated from one part of the country to another or who travel often and far, daily life is acted out within rather narrowly circumscribed areal limits. The daily comings and goings of individuals ordinarily do not take them very far from their residences. Places of work, schools, shopping, recreation, and even the residences of most friends and kin are ordinarily located within easy reaching distance. Although it is true that these distances have increased as transportation has improved, it is still the case that the daily lives of most Americans are lived within a fifty mile radius of their homes.

---

*P. H. Rossi, Why Families Move, The Free Press: Glencoe, Illinois, 1955.

More than anything else, these areal characteristics of daily life account for the persistence of local communities as centers of public attention and societal concern. In the final analysis, social trends and social policy have their direct impacts upon individuals in the form of local manifestations. Fluctuations in the rate of employment are experienced directly in the hiring and firing behaviors of specific plants and businesses in localities throughout the country. The decline of an industry means empty plants in specific places. Consumer price changes are reflected in the price tags and markings in specific local stores. The administration of justice and law enforcement is largely in the hands of local police forces and local courts. Federal policy in education ultimately affects school children and their parents through the impact of such policy on local school systems and neighborhood schools. And so on.

Perhaps the most dramatic contemporary example of the localized character of larger social changes are the events associated with the changing status of American Negroes. Although much of the drive for movement toward equality has been directed at the national government, most of the action has taken place on the local scene. In the early stages of the civil rights movement, it was local public accomodations which were the targets of sit-ins. City halls have been picketed far more frequently than state legislatures or Congress. Desegregation in either schools or in housing has taken place in local school systems and local neighborhoods.

The civil disorders since 1964 have been local disturbances in which the antagonists have been ghetto residents, local police and local institutions. The manifestations are parochial although it is not at all clear that the underlying problems are mainly local. The problems of race relations press most heavily on local institutions; but are significant powers to affect relevant outcomes clearly at the command of mayors, city councils, police chiefs or other local officials? Local officials are not likely to be able to provide effective remedies for the grievances involved. Many of the root causes lie in the national economy and national institutions and certainly the major amounts of legal power and resources are in the hands of national--not local--officials. Thus while city hall and municipal agencies are on the receiving end of complaints and demands, they are relatively impotent to do anything which would effectively meet those demands. To be sure, a sensitive and charismatic mayor can help to mitigate conflict (e.g., Lindsay of New York), but the half-life of charm and concern, unaccompanied by power and resources, is getting shorter and shorter as the demands for equality and equal treatment grow.

There is one sense in which the local community clearly is an important link in national policy: national policies have to be implemented on the local level and effective municipal officials can make efficient use of the resources which are given to them or they

can transform a national policy into a local farce.* Much of local civil rights conflict stems around this point, although without clear measures of program effectiveness, much of the struggle turns around symbolic (as opposed to "real") issues.

Thus the local community is important at least as the point at which the outputs of our national society and its international relations are delivered to citizens.

The local community is also the setting for the major events in the life cycles of individuals. It is obvious that the local community supplies to its individual citizens the medical facilities in which he is born, the schools in which he is taught, the housing in which he lives, the social milieu in which he finds his mate and sets up his household, the factories and businesses in which he finds employment and finally the cemetery in which he is buried. Individuals and households live mainly and almost entirely within local communities. The local community serves and at most plays a significant role in the shaping of those experiences.

Even the minimal role of backdrop can be important, at least as forming part of childhood memories and perhaps conditioning one's sense

---

*Indeed, one of the major problems in the evaluation of social action programs is what has come to be called the "non-program problem;" that is, it is often found that a local school system or other local institution has accepted funds to run a local program, has turned in regular progress reports, but investigators sent out from Washington or regional offices can find no sign that the program has ever existed.

of space and tolerance for density of structures and people. To grow up in a rural neighborhood may mean no more than a preference for more space and a lower tolerance for high levels of interpersonal contacts, but this is an important effect.

If we accord a more important position to the local community, then it may be viewed as a factor of considerable weight in a wide range of outcomes. For example, some educators accord an important role to the average level of support for intellectual achievement in a community in motivating students to learn. If this view is correct, then a child's achievement in school can be related to the characteristic climate of opinion in the residential community in which he lives.

Thus, one of the main empirical issues in the social psychological study of local communities is to ascertain whether the roles played by the local community in the lives of individuals are more in the way of a backdrop, providing a setting in which autochthonous processes are going on, or whether local community characteristics are a significant input to the levels of well being within areas above and beyond the characteristics of individuals and households living in such areas. Furthermore, assuming that there are such community effects, then another critical issue concerns unravelling the causal links between community characteristics and effects manifested in individuals and households.

Still another role that the local community can play in the lives

of individual residents is as a link to the larger society. For example, the fact that one lives in a community whose industry is declining because of a general decline in demand for its products on the national market conditions the ability of the individual to obtain employment. The source of the employment difficulty lies in the national market for the product in question, and the community plays a role as a sort of mediating link between national processes and local events. Similarly, changes in national policies concerning support for local school systems, procurement policies vis-a-vis defense material, and the like can all have their impact on individuals and households through the way in which community characteristics interact with those national processes.

So far we have emphasized the locality as a causal factor in affecting outcomes in individual or household behaviors. There is another way of looking at locality, as a consummatory goal. Thus a locality under this viewpoint would be regarded like any other consumer good, a source of gratification or annoyance but not as a conditioner of behavior in other respects. From this viewpoint we may regard localities in much the same way that we regard automobiles: as a means of transportation, it matters very little whether a car is a Ford or Chevrolet, but this brand distinction may be important as far as some types of gratification are concerned. In the same way, where one lives--within a broad range of differences in neighborhood composition, housing types, etc.--may not make much of a difference, e.g.,

in opinions on foreign policy--but it may make a difference in individuals' satisfaction with their housing and neighborhood.

In other words, people may care whether they live in one or another locality because living in one place or another affects their levels of satisfaction and not because they are profoundly affected by one or another community.* Under this last interpretation, local communities are market phenomena created by the price structure of housing, differential distribution of income and the varying schedules of preferences held by individuals and households concerning the priorities they are willing to allocate to expenditures on housing and location as opposed to other types of goods or investments.

We will not be able to distinguish in this paper to what extent it is proper to think of local communities as major inputs into individuals and households or to what extent is residential location mainly a matter of individuals' and households' ability and willingness to compete on the housing market. To be able to do so (or at least to get closer to doing so) can be expected to be the outcome of a program on research on local communities.

---

*Similar phenomena can be seen in other areas of life. Thus, virtually no studies of classroom size have found class size related to measures of learning achievement, yet students, teachers and parents all express strong preferences for small classes. (Cf., Coleman, James S. et al., Equality of Educational Opportunity, Washington, GPO, 1966).

II. Conceptions of "Community"

The term "community" carries with it such a freight of meanings from vernacular usage, that it is often persuasively argued that sociologists would be much better off to drop the term and invent new ones to cover the phenomena in question. We all "know what we mean" by "community" when we use the term in the contexts of everyday conversation, but these meanings interfere with the comprehension of the term when it is used with more precise intentions.*

Much of the difficulty with the use of the term "community" stems around its use to cover two quite different classes of phenomena. On the one hand, the term is used to designate a commensalistic social group, each member of which shares an important characteristic in common and in which each member of the group is significantly conscious of being a member of the group. Thus we speak of the "scientific community," composed of scientists who share in common an occupational acitivity and who view themselves as sharing common interests and even a common fate. Or, we may think in terms of the "Jewish," "Catholic," or "Negro" communities, in which members share religious beliefs or common ancestral origins. Very often such communities also have a

---

*For example, at the present time, the term "Community" is used as a quick shorthand to mean the black ghettos of our large cities. There have been several conferences in which black militant leaders and sociologists have been completely talking past each other because the former used the term to mean blacks and the latter used the term to cover a much wider group, usually the central city or the metropolitan area.

spatial location or members may sufficiently concentrate in space to be able to add a modifying phrase incorporating a geographic location. Thus we may speak of the "Hasidic Community of Williamsburg," an area of Brooklyn, New York which contains an unusual concentration of members of this particular Jewish sect.

We also use the term "community" to refer to social groups which are held together by the complementarity of their differences. Thus when we refer to Muncie, Indiana as a community we are referring to a symbiotic social group who have in common the fact that they inhabit and, on a diurnal cycle, circulate within a circumscribed geographic area but also at the same time are composed of a rather wide diversity of socio-economic, ethnic and political backgrounds. The ties that bind individuals and households together in such a symbiotic community are ones of exchange in which the units specialize in activities the products of which are used largely by others.

When we use the term community in a symbiotic sense we usually refer to larger groupings than when we use the term in a commensalistic sense. Thus a metropolitan area plus its surrounding dependent hinterland may be viewed as a community engaged in intensive intra-area exchange of sociability, goods and services, but hardly as a community in the sense of sharing a common identity. For the latter type of community we generally look to smaller areas characterized by socio-economic and/or ethnic homogeneity, areas which are primarily residential in character.

Neither the commensalistic nor the symbiotic versions of the concept of community are readily translated into operational forms. It is not easy to determine areas that can be marked off characterizing either places in which residents engage in interchange of sufficient density or which are inhabited by relatively homogeneous populations. Sharply delineated boundaries ordinarily cannot be found, and a sharply delineated boundary when found usually turns out to be trivial, e.g., waterfronts, mountain ranges, etc.* In the usual case, boundaries have to be drawn somewhat arbitrarily leaving the researcher with a feeling of dissatisfaction over not having done adequate justice to the richness of the concept of community he had in mind. In the end we are reduced, faute de mieux, to drawing the areal boundaries of communities using the seemingly arbitrarily drawn boundaries of political units (cities, counties, wards, etc.) or the equally arbitrarily drawn boundaries of census small areas (census tracts, enumeration districts, blocks, etc.). The areal aggregation of small units is ordinarily to be preferred over the use of larger units, although greater operational discretion is given to the researcher and hence greater anxiety results.**

---

*They are trivial in that such physical features become boundaries because they are barriers to human habitation. Homes, factories and office buildings cannot be built on water, on the side of steep mountains, etc., except at prohibitive costs.

**A number of schemes have been proposed and used as rules for aggregating small areas into relatively homogeneous larger areas or into non-contiguous strata of similar areas. For example, Shevky and Williams (Ershref Shevky and Marilyn Williams, The Social Areas of Los Angeles, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1949) have proposed a method of aggregating census tracts into homogeneous strata by using factor analysis of census tract characteristics. Despite considerable criticism, the methods proposed have been widely used, largely because reasonable alternatives are equally arbitrary and hence a more established arbitrary scheme is to be preferred.

From the viewpoint of developing a social psychology of local communities it is not clear whether the commensalistic version or the symbiotic version of the concept of community is to be preferred. It would appear at first thought that the commensalistic view which stresses solidarity and consciousness of kind would be preferred by social psychologists, but it turns out that whether or not (and why) a particular areal aggregation of individuals and households manifest consciousness of kind or solidarity is a major question raised by the social psychologist who looks at local communities. Hence the relationships between the phenomena underlying the two alternative definitions of community constitute one of the major problems for sociologists and social psychologists interested in the study of local communities.* If we view the process of modernization as involving an increase in the complexity of the division of labor along with a corresponding increase in the densities of human settlements, then a major problem becomes knowing the conditions in which the sense of community as a commensalistic collectivity can be maintained in populations characterized by increasing differentiation.

---

*Maurice A. Stein, (The Eclipse of Community, Princeton University Press: Princeton, 1960) has reviewed major community studies undertaken by sociologists and anthropologists. He finds that the central problem in each of the studies is the disappearance of the sense of community as a positive shared membership on the part of the community residents.

This general question is also an important one politically, the problem being the conditions under which the differentiation within a population leads to a breakdown in widespread commitment to the political structure governing an area. How to define the public interest in such a fashion as to attain the support of most of the city's residents is the prime question facing the local public officials of our time.

The search for an adequate definition of the term "community" is in all likelihood another search for the Holy Grail. There are entirely too many diverse connotations to the term for any definition to encompass all. Much more fruitful conceptual advances can be made by differentiating out specific aspects of the global term and devising new concepts, each constructed with a view to problems of operationalization.

The present author has found it useful to employ the definitions which follow:

A residential locality consists of the population (individuals and households) who make their residences* in an arbitrarily defined

---

*By social convention each individual and household is characterized by an address, designating a place in space, in which personal possessions are usually stored and to which other persons seeking to contact the unit in question can go with the knowledge of a relatively high probability of finding the unit in question. For many organizations and institutions an address can be defined in the same way, although the unit to be contacted would often have to be defined as some individual authorized to receive messages on behalf of the organization or institution in question. Thus a school has an address and the administrators, clerks and teachers may be regarded as persons who can receive messages on behalf of the school. For some aggregated units, addresses would not be easy to define. For example, a friendship group may not have a unique address but be defined by the addresses of each of its members. Or a police detachment which services the residents of an area may have no specific address within that area because the police are on mobile patrol.

area along with those organizations and institutions which are also "resident" in that area. Thus a municipality is a residential locality, defined by political boundaries (more or less arbitrary), consisting of the persons, business firms, municipal agencies, churches, voluntary organizations, etc. that have addresses in the area defined by the boundaries. A census tract or ward or enumeration district may similarly be regarded as residential localities, with only the minimum requirement that some persons and/or some organizations have addresses within that area. Thus a park is not ordinarily a residential locality nor is a tract of vacant land.

The concept "residential locality" is useful to designate the basic units of inquiry in the study of local communities, being flexible enough to cover a variety of specific types of units (e.g., regions, municipalities, counties, census tracts, blocks, etc.) and easily translated into operational form. It should also be obvious that one would be interested more in some types of residential localities than others: for example, residential localities which are also municipal corporations would be of greater interest to the student of local politics than residential localities which cut across a number of municipal boundaries. Thus, a research worker would define residential localities differently depending on his problem, seeking boundaries which are more likely to be relevant to the problem under study.

The reader has undoubtedly already noticed that the concept residential locality completely sidesteps the issue of what are optimum areal

boundaries for the definition of areas of interest to social scientists. It proposes as a methodological device the setting of arbitrary boundaries around areas, the setting of which may be guided by convenience (as, for example, in the picking of census tracts, wards or other administratively defined areal units as residential localities) or by some substantive interest (e.g., residential localities which are also areas which are governed by significant political structures).

Once the boundaries or localities are set, then it becomes a question whether the areas so set have other properties of interest and derivative from the general concept of community discussed earlier. The remainder of the terms listed below are concerned with the properties of residential localities, expressed in terms of variables:

The <u>solidarity</u> of a residential locality designates the extent to which residents in the locality identify themselves as similar in some significant way to other residents. In this connection we can distinguish between <u>total solidarity</u>, designating the extent and strength of bonds of identification with all of the residents of a locality, and <u>segmental solidarity</u>, the extent and strength of bonds of identification with subgroups of residents in a locality. It should be noted that <u>solidarity</u> is at least a large part of the global concept of community especially when the commensalistic aspects of community are stressed. Thus when the Lynds* in their studies of Muncie, Indiana

---

*Robert S. and Helen M. Lynd, <u>Middletown</u> (Harcourt Brace, N.Y., 1929) and <u>Middletown in Transition</u>, Harcourt Brace, N.Y., 1937.

remark on the changes in that city's sense of community accompanying industrialization, they are referring to a change in the total solidarity of the residential locality formed by the political boundaries of Muncie. In contrast, Elin Anderson's* study of Manchester, New Hampshire stressed the extent of segmental solidarity in Manchester, the main segment being those formed by class, religion and ethnicity.

A rather obvious expectation is that total solidarity and segmental solidarity tend to be negatively related. Thus a residential locality in which the residents consider themselves mainly as members of ethnic or religious groups is not one in which we would expect that there would be much identification with the total community. But, this is a point which can be answered by empirical evidence. It may well be the case that residential localities fall into a typological scheme as shown below with signficant numbers of localities to be found in each of the cells of the typological scheme:

A Typological Scheme for Residential Localities

Segmental Solidarity	High	Low
High	Type A: E.g., New York City or other major metro	Type B: Community in conflict
Low	Type C: Homogeneous dormitory suburb	Type D: Transient Neighborhood

*Elin Anderson, We Americans (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1937).

Type A would represent a locality which has both high segmental solidarity and high total solidarity. This may be best represented by our great metropolitan areas, e.g., New York and Chicago, which are both characterized by a widespread sense of identification of residents with the total community and at the same time a high sense of ethnic, racial and religious identities.

Type B would represent a locality in which the population is divided into solidary subgroups with little sense of collective identity, as for example Gary, Indiana shortly after the election of Richard Hatcher, a Negro, as Mayor when some of the white residential neighborhoods made moves toward seceding from the city. Perhaps some of the cities in the Deep South might also be characterized as falling into this group as well.

Type C might best be represented by small homogeneous towns or one social class dormitory suburbs. Finally, Type D is best represented by a locality which has no particular sense of identity, as for example, a transient apartment hotel area.

The integration of a residential locality designates the extent to which the residents of the locality are linked by ties of exchange, ranging from relatively intangible transactions involving sociability through participation in formally structured organizations to the more tangible exchanges involved in the labor, services and consumer markets. Again, one may distinguish between total integration, the extent to which all the significant ties of exchange entered into by residents

are with other residents and segmental integration, the extent to which ties of particular types are formed among residents of a locality. Obviously a given residential locality may be highly integrated as far as sociability is concerned with many friendship and visiting ties among residents, but be rated very low as far as segmental integration in a labor market sense, with most residents working in some other locality. Indeed, this is the stereotype of the upper-middle class suburb, most of whose residents are reputed to commute to work into the central city.

One may also find it useful to distinguish between vertical and horizontal segmental integration, the former characterizing the density of ties of specific types in a residential locality (e.g., purchasing heavy durable consumer goods, membership in community improvement associations, friendships, etc.) and the latter singling out the types of individuals and households among whom ties are developed (e.g., race, ethnicity, socio-economic level, etc.). Thus a residential locality may be characterized as having a high degree of horizontal segmental integration, meaning that there are high densities of some ties within delineated social groups but few ties across group lines, as, for example, kinship or friendship ties in relation to race.

It is important to stress the differences between the concepts of solidarity and integration. By solidarity we mean the extent to which residents of a locality consider themselves to be members of some social group either identical with the locality in extent or some

subgroup within that locality. Thus the extent to which residents of New York City identify themselves as New Yorkers is an expression of the solidarity of New York City as a residential locality. Expressions of solidarity may range from mere identification with place names, e.g., New Yorker, Chicagoans, etc., to willingness to make personal sacrifices in the name of the locality, e.g., willing to serve in the locality's armed forces, pay taxes willingly, etc.

In contrast, the concept of integration covers transactions among individuals and groups. Thus a residential locality may be integrated in a soft goods market sense if the residents purchase most of their soft goods from others in the locality. Or, a locality may be integrated in a social sense if most of the interpersonal contacts of the residents take place with other residents. Integration is defined by transactions of any sort and hence would ordinarily appear with a modifier indicating the type of transaction involved, e.g., consumer market integration would refer to transactions involving individual and household purchases, sociability integration refers to ties of friendship, visiting, and so on.

It should also be noted that the concept "integration" is much more complex than the concept of solidarity. There are more specific ways in which a locality can be integrated than there are ways in which its residents can express their solidarity. In the end, the measurement of the solidarity of a locality is some variant of the extent to which residents identify themselves in some essential sense as sharing the

same social characteristics. The term integration has a much larger set of operational forms, each covering transactions of a different sort. In this connection one may distinguish between several broad types of transactions: sociability transactions, involving exchanges among residents in the form of friendship ties, visiting relationships, informal talk, etc.; political transactions, involving the exchange of support and benefits in the process of wielding legitimate political authority; and economic transactions, involving the exchange of goods and services using money as the medium of exchange.*

It is also useful to consider the degree to which a residential locality is politically autonomous as a third variable. A residential locality is politically autonomous to the extent that it may legitimately make collective decisions which are binding upon the residents of that locality. To attain political autonomy, a residential area would have to have a set of legitimate rules for making collective decisions, a set of officials designated as having the authority to en-

---

*Other writers have used the term integration to cover somewhat different phenomena. For example, Robert C. Angell ("The Social Integration of Selected American Cities," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 57, pp. 575-592) has defined integration in terms of the extent to which elites in cities demonstrate a commitment to social welfare action. An early attempt to differentiate among types of integration is represented by Werner S. Landecker, "Types of Integration and Their Measurement," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 56, pp. 332-340. Both attempts center around the use of integration to designate the extent to which various aspects of a society are consistent with each other.

force compliance with those decisions and a set of sanctions available to be applied in the case of non-compliance: in short, it must have a government. Governments vary widely in the extent to which their decisions are binding and over which types of human behavior the decisions can be legtimately made, hence residential localities may be viewed as spanning a range from those completely lacking any separate government and hence lacking all political autonomy to those which have so much autonomy that they may be regarded as separate national states, as in the city-states of late medieval Europe. For our purposes here, however, we would be mainly concerned with the lower end of the autonomy continuum dealing with varying degrees of autonomy within the range occupied by most American local government units.

The concepts of solidarity, integration and political autonomy have been offered in this paper as a set of terms which cover the main meanings of the term "community" yet which have the important properties of being able to differentiate among residential localities in important ways. Thus, when we ask whether a particular residential locality is a "community" we need now to describe the locality along a minimum of three dimensions. Thus at the one extreme, the folk societies described by Robert Redfield are residential localities characterized by high solidarity, high total integration, and high political autonomy. The residential localities to be found in industrialized urbanized societies can be expected to vary along all three dimensions. We can anticipate, however, that the empirical correla-

tions among the dimensions place some restrictions on their free play; for example, we hypothesize that there are few highly integrated localities which are not also politically autonomous.

Of course, there are many aspects of residential localities which are not dealt with within the context of these three concepts. For example, among the more important dimensions are those of size and density, viewed either in terms of space or population. Size of place, roughly indexed by the number of people inhabiting a politically autonomous locality, has been found time and time again to condition strongly important characteristics of cities. Nor have we dealt with stratification phenomena. And so on. Their omission in this scheme does not mean that we do not believe them to be important, it only means that we do not consider them to be relevant to the definition of the class of phenomena that are part of the overall concept of community. Obviously, in any empirical analysis of a given class of phenomena, e.g., achievement in learning within a school system, such variables would come to play an important role.*

---

*Indeed, given existing politically defined local communities as the subjects of inquiry and relying mainly on Census derived data,one would be well advised to devise classification systems which used primarily size of place and socio-economic variables. See Otis Dudley Duncan and Albert J. Reiss, Social Characteristics of Urban and Rural Communities, 1950, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1956, or Brian J. L. Berry and Elaine Neils, "Location, Size and Shape of Cities as Influenced by Environmental Factors: The Urban Environment Writ Large," in Harvey S. Perloff (ed.), The Quality of the Urban Environment, Resources for the Future, Inc., The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Maryland, 1969.

III. Some Social Psychological Problems in the Measurement of "Community"

The preceding section of this chapter has developed a frame of reference for the elaboration of a set of operational definitions of community which are centered around geographical areas as basic units. It is concerned with developing measures which could place such units within a multi-dimensional property space expressing basic ideas underlying the global concept of community. In very specific terms, the framework developed is concerned with measuring the extent to which an area (New York City) can be likened to another area (e.g., Chicago) with respect to characteristics which are at the heart of the concept of community.

The global concept of "community," however, is one which is very much in popular usage and hence carries with it a bundle of meanings for individuals in our society. For example, the question, "How do you like this community?" is a meaningful one to most individuals, and is frequently asked of persons newly arrived in a residential locality. Similarly, the term "neighborhood" has some meaning to individuals, at least in the sense that everyday conversations apparently contain the term without so much ambiguity that meaningful interaction is impossible.

The apparent meaningfulness of such terms as community and neighborhood has led to their use in empirical studies. Respondents have been asked to rate their neighborhoods and communities according to a variety of criteria ranging from friendliness to shopping convenience. Respondents have also been asked to assess the social composition of their communities, to list community organizations and indicate whom they consider to be influential and powerful. And so on.

The precise referent of neighborhood or community as used in such research is left to the respondent to supply. It is obvious that without further specification it is not at all clear whether respondents have in mind any clearly delineated residential locality or whether a set of respondents who reside in a given residential locality have the same spatial referents in mind. Hence the aggregation of such responses over the residents of a specific residential locality in order to characterize the residential locality by some aggregated measure is fraught with some danger. Of course, in the case of political or other types of areas to which definite and well known boundaries are given, it is possible to specify the residential locality in strongly enough delineated terms that there is less question whether respondents in such localities are using the same frame of reference. For example, questions which ask who is influential in Atlanta, Georgia or Peoria, Illinois* are more likely to evoke a common residential locality as a frame of reference than questions which ask who is influential in "this neighborhood." However, only those residential localities which have definite and well known boundaries are amenable to such treatment. Smaller residential localities such as named neighborhoods whose boundaries are not either formally fixed or well known do not lend themselves easily to such treatment.

Some research has been conducted on how individuals conceive of

---

*Even such questions may have a false sense of specificity since some respondent may answer in terms of the political boundaries of Peoria, for example, and others in terms of the city and its adjoining suburbs.

their neighborhoods. However, these researches* have not been able to show that there are definite principles which govern how individuals define their neighborhoods. Indeed, in some cases, there is considerable disagreement among residents over the name "commonly" used to designate their neighborhoods. There are some hints that very salient physical boundaries, e.g., a main thoroughfare, an elevated line, or a stream or river, are likely to be chosen as boundaries, but in the more usual case individuals define their neighborhoods in what seems to be almost idiosyncratic ways.

In a pioneering and very fascinating attempt to get at how people view their cities, Kevin Lynch** asked small samples of persons living in the Boston, Los Angeles and Jersey City metropolitan areas to draw maps of their cities in which those features significant to the subjects were marked. Subjects tended to draw maps which exaggerated prominences in the downtown areas and accented the lines of daily travel of the subjects. The downtown prominences (tall buildings, art museums, city halls, etc.) tended to be the objects marked in common by the subjects with idiosyncratic elements in each map conditioned by the special diurnal motility of the drawer. As might be expected,

---

*S. Riemer, "Villagers in Metropolis," British Journal of Sociology, II, 1 March 1951; R. L. Wilson, "Liveability of the City," in F. S. Chapin and S. F. Weiss (eds.), Urban Growth Dynamics in a Regional Cluster of Cities, N. Y., Wiley, 1962; H. L. Ross, "The Local Community: A Survey Approach," American Sociological Review, 27, 1 February, 1962. The present author (in an unpublished research) asked respondents in four census tracts in the city of Philadelphia to name the four boundaries of their neighborhoods. Only in one of the census tracts which was bounded by railroad tracks running in deep ruts was there any significant agreement among respondents on the boundaries of the neighborhood.

**Kevin Lynch, The Image of the City, Cambridge, The MIT Press, 1960.

the three cities studied varied in the extent to which the subjects' maps had features in common. Los Angeles, in particular, stood out as a city which had few prominent features which all subjects would place upon their maps, reflecting the fact that in Los Angeles a Central Business District never developed to the same extent as in older East Coast cities.

It should be abundantly clear from even the fragments of researches cited in the last few pages that the operational definition of a particular residential locality is not likely to match the general conceptions of either "community" or "neighborhood" which individual residents form in their minds nor the specific referents of those terms in the immediate life experiences of individuals. Indeed, it was precisely because it would be difficult, if not impossible, to define neighborhoods and communities in such a fashion that residents (even a majority thereof) would agree on common boundaries and membership criteria that led to the development of the concept of residential locality which would be independent of the existence of consensus among residents.

There are, however, types of residential localities which are useful for research purposes and are also likely to have some meaning to many individual residents as social psychological entities. Major political subdivisions such as cities, towns, counties, and states are quite likely to be quite meaningful as frames of reference to individual residents. Thus it is possible to frame attitude items concerning

specific political entities like New York City, Peoria, Illinois, or Baltimore county. Indeed, it is precisely because such politically defined residential localities are the focus of political decision making--ranging from electoral battles to the passing of ordinances by local legislatures--that political subdivisions are residential localities which have some meaning to all of their residents. Note that not all political subdivisions have this characteristic: special purpose subdivisions which are purely administrative in character (e.g., mosquito abatement districts, the catchment area of a general hospital, and so on) and which do not define a political decision making institution and accompanying electoral contest are not likely to have very much meaning to persons who are resident within such areas.*

Hence the residential localities which are of special interest turn out to be relatively autonomous political subdivisions. They tend to be residential localities of which residents are aware and of which they perceive themselves to be members. They are also of interest from a social policy point of view since as relatively autonomous political entities they are capable of formulating policy within certain constitutional limitations as defined by states and the federal government,

---

*Milton Kotler in his recent book, Neighborhood Government (Bobbs-Merrill, Indianapolis, 1969), makes the point that when we find subareas within larger political subdivisions which have established and well recognized names (e.g., Brooklyn, Kensington, Philadelphia, Hyde Park in Chicago, etc.), they tend to have been areas which were once autonomous political subdivisions. His point is that political autonomy and electoral systems are the institutions around which the sense of "community" (solidarity, in our terms) is built.

in the case of American cities.

The most useful operational definition of community turns out in practice to be that of relatively autonomous political subdivisions. Subareas within such political subdivisions which are also residential localities are close to the idea of neighborhood, although necessarily vaguely defined social psychologically and can only be given any precise definition by assuming arbitrary boundaries.

IV. Appropriate Research Design Strategies

There are two broad classes of usage to which may be put indicators of some of the social psychological aspects of life in residential localities. First, such indicators may be used to assess the state of residential living in the country as a whole or in broad regions or other areas composed of aggregates of many specific residential localities. Thus in this connection one would be concerned with, for example, changes in levels of satisfaction with policeprotection in the United States as a whole or in contrasting levels according to cities of varying sizes in the several regions of the United States. Indeed, some times series (although of a very primitive nature) can be constructed at present from repeated questions asked by the national polling organizations over the past two or three decades. Special surveys can be repeated again to establish trends over time. In this last connection it may be worthwhile to repeat the special surveys* conducted for some of the recent national commissions on crime or violence or on general life satisfactions.

The second way of proceeding would be to relate such social indicators to specific residential localities. Although establishing national, regional, or even place size differences on a variety of measures would certainly be an important aim of a program of social

---

*President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1967. National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, To Establish Justice, to Insure Domestic Tranquility, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1969.

psychological indicators, more important substantive and policy related series could be constructed using specific residential localities as the units of analysis. The advantages of this mode of proceeding would be two fold: first, through such a program it would be possible to determine what are the characteristics of residential localities which are related to such social psychological indicators. For example, it may turn out that localities containing homogeneous populations in socio-economic terms are more likely to evidence high levels of total solidarity, especially under the condition of relative political autonomy, than communities with opposite characteristics. Secondly, there is enough interest in specific localities, especially the major metropolitan areas, that it would be useful to be able to make comparisons between, say Chicago and Detroit, or New York and Los Angeles, especially as trends in those cities are related to differences in policies pursued by local municipal administrations. Finally, it should be pointed out that a program of social psychological indicators which could make statements about specific communities could also be designed to provide generalizations about the nation as a whole, regions, and places of various sizes.

The strategy suggested here is that of large scale comparative community studies. A much more convincing case could be made for this strategy if there were a large and distinguished body of empirical research to which one could refer for evidence on its utility. Despite the fact that local communities have been a favorite research subject for sociologists from the early beginnings of empirical social research,

it is not possible to point to many precedents. The tradition of research on local communities has tended to be focussed on particular local communities. Although such case studies tended to be implicitly comparative, the comparisons involved have ordinarily been either very restricted (as, for example, in the case of the Lynds' study* of Muncie, Indiana in which Muncie at a particular point in time is compared with itself at another point in time) or with some other unspecified communities (as, for example, in Vidich and Bensman's study** of a small upstate New York community which is compared with an "image" of a metropolis). Systematic comparative community studies covering a large enough number of cases to permit the establishment on a firm basis of the existence of significant inter-community differences in these respects are most entirely non-existent.***

The major factor impeding the development of comparative community studies along the lines necessary has been the high cost of conducting such studies. Since most of the measures to be developed below would require sampling residents of communities to develop aggregate measures of social pscyhological dimensions of residential localities,

---

*R. S. and H. M. Lynd, op. cit.

**A. Vidich and W. Bensman, Small Town in a Mass Society, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1958.

***Comparative community studies based upon data collected in the decennial censuses and ranging across a relatively large number of cities have been the major type of large scale comparative studies. However, the decennial Census contains no data on the issues raised either in the definitions given in the previous section of this chapter or on related social psychological dimensions of residential localities.

each such locality to be studied would require a sample of sufficient size to establish a fairly firm reading on each locality. If one is to study localities of appreciable size assuming a given fixed level of accuracy in estimation, the sample size required for each locality is, for all practical purposes, the same as that required for a sample of the nation as a whole.* Hence a study of fifty localities requires a total sample size that is fifty times the sample size required to study the nation as a whole. Few research plans have been able to enjoy the level of support to be able to study a large enough number of localities to provide some hard empirical basis for evaluating the utility of the measures suggested below.** It should also be noted that a sample size of fifty is by no means a fully adequate sample size. Since residential localities which are also major political subdivisions vary widely in population size and density, and it can also be anticipated that both will have important impacts on most of the social psychological indicators being proposed here, a sample size of fifty would be

---

*This is because the fiduciary limits of a sample measure are much more affected by the size of the sample than by the size of the universe sampled, especially if that universe contains more than a few hundred units.

**For example, two studies of fifteen major American cities conducted on behalf of the Kerner Commission one by the Survey Research Center, involving small samples of blacks and whites in general population samples and by James S. Coleman and the present author of members of selected occupational groups (policemen, social workers, educators, merchants, employers and political party workers) who were surveying black ghetto populations cost almost $400,000 initially for data collection for the first round of analysis and will probably cost an additional $100,000 to carry the analysis through to completion. (National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, Supplemental Studies, GPO, Washington, 1968.)

quite inadequate for all but the most primitive analyses.*

Of course, one may ease the requirement that the same level of accuracy is desired for each residential locality that one would desire for the nation as a whole. Thus, although any one individual city may not be measured very well with intra-city samples of 50 respondents, the relationships across cities may be just as accurately represented for a relatively large number of cities, than if intra-city samples of 500 were used.**

Comparative community studies employing relatively large samples of communities can be accomplished relatively inexpensively if the topics being studied are those for which probability samples of the general population are not required or inappropriate. Thus a study of the formal characteristics of school systems as related to the method of selection of school board members can be accomplished by interviewing a relatively small number of people in each school sys-

---

*The issues involved in studying localities on a comparative basis have been extremely well stated in a plan to provide a long range evaluation of the Model Cities Program planned jointly by the Urban Institute and the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan (see J. S. Wholley, et al., Survey Research Related to Evaluation of the Model Cities Program: Second Quarterly Progress Report, The Urban Institute, Washington, D.C., 1969 (Multilith).

**Perhaps the easiest way to bolster this strategy is to consider that in a regression analysis in which the units are cities, the degrees of freedom and hence the statistical significance of correlation coefficients and associated regression coefficients are dependent on the number of units used, i.e., number of cities, and not on the number of observations which go into each of the values for each city. Somewhat the same reasoning can be derived from considering an analysis of variance model in which one is trying to estimate the unique contributions of inter-city variance and intra-city variance to the total variance among individuals. In the analysis of variance model, more is gained by increasing the number of cities than by increasing the number of individual observations within cities.

tem. A plan* for setting up a data gathering apparatus for the purpose of conducting such studies and for archiving data on a relatively large sample of American cities is presently in the early stages of organization and testing. Within the next few years it should be possible to undertake continuing studies of the political and institutional structures of a large sample (150) of American municipalities in the size ranges of 25,000 and above. It should be noted, however, that the social psychological indicators suggested in this chapter mainly require the use of adequate samples of the general populations of residential localities and hence would not be appropriately served by the community sampling strategy proposed by Crain and Rossi.

Lying behind the argument of this section is the assumption that most social psychological indicators would be based on sample surveys of individuals in which the answers to survey questionnaires would be aggregated over residential localities in order to obtain summary measures which would characterize the social psychological characteristics of those areas. In an intriguing volume, Webb and his associates** have proposed that for many variables of the sort being considered here, a more valid approach would be to define indicators which were not depen-

---

*P. H. Rossi and R. Crain, "The NORC Permanent Community Sample," The Public Opinion Quarterly, Summer, 1968. For an example of the kinds of studies which can be conducted using the Permanent Community Sample, see R. Crain and P. H. Rossi, "Comparative Community Studies with Large N's," Proceedings American Statistical Association, Social Statistics, Section, 1968.

**E.J. Webb, D. T. Campbell, R. D. Schwartz, and L. Sechrest, Unobtrusive Measures: Nonreactive Research in the Social Sciences, Rand McNally, Chicago, 1966.

dent upon verbal responses to personal interviews or written questionnaires. Thus, a measure of interracial tensions might rely on samples of conversations overheard by observers riding public transportation or on the sales records of firms which sell firearms. Webb and his associates assert that such "unobtrusive" measures reflect more nearly the "true" state of affairs than the responses made to questions posed by interviewers, or written on questionnaires. Many of the measures suggested are ingenious and intriguing, and may well be adapted for use as social psychological indicators. It should be noted that whether obtrusive measures or unobtrusive measures are employed, the same general problems of research design will be encountered and hence the discussion in this section applies regardless of specific data collection techniques employed.

V. Social Psychological "Community" Indicators

The issues discussed in the previous sections of this chapter set forth a general framework for the development of a set of specific social psychological indicators. The task of this section is to suggest what forms such indicators might take and the specific topics to be covered. In some cases it has been possible to cite concrete researches which have developed measures which might be used directly as working definitions or used as such with slight modifications. In the main, however, the suggestions made below require additional development and some experimentation before workable operational measures exist.

The general framework suggested in the earlier part of this chapter provides only part of the impetus for the set of indicators of this section. There are aspects of life in communities of traditional concern which are not encompassed in that framework. We have attempted to cover the more important of such traditional concerns in this section. For example, since residential localities, by definition, are made up of housing units and hence are very heavily influenced by housing market considerations, attitudes towards housing, neighborhood amenities, cost-time factors in travel, and so on, are important aspects of life in localities. Measures of attitudes towards such matters are considered as part of the set of social psychological indicators outlined in this section.

The strategy of this section is to lay out in rather general terms

the variables which should be tapped by the set of social psychological indicators. Specific forms for the indicators (e.g., interview schedule items, existing statistical series, etc.), when available, have been described in footnotes, indicating the tentative status of such suggested operational forms. For the most part, well established social psychological indicators for the variables listed below have not yet been constructed and/or tested extensively enough for the present author to be very comfortable in suggesting their adoption.

No distinction has been made in this section between those indicators which could be applied to very large residential localities (e.g., central cities of major metropolitan areas) and small localities which are subareas within larger political subdivisions, neighborhoods. In principle, the indicators are applicable to any arbitrarily defined area whether a part of a city block or a large municipality. In practice, areas which are also political subdivisions will be the localities in which one mainly would be interested, at least for the purpose of establishing a set of social indicators.

A. Orientations to Localities as Collectivities

The main issue in the set of variables to be considered under this rubric is whether or not (or the extent to which) the members of a particular residential locality consider the population and institutions of that area to constitute a significant collectivity. The literature of community studies has been very much concerned with this issue, although it cannot be said that measures of the orientations of

residents to their localities as collectivities have been developed beyond the most primitive level.

In terms of the definitions presented to Section II of this chapter, solidarity is the quality of residential communities which is proposed to be measured by the indicators suggested here. For a residential locality to exhibit relatively high solidarity, two conditions have to be obtained: first, a relatively large proportion of the residents have to conceive of the locality as having the characteristics of a collectivity, i.e., be perceived as an identifiable group with some ability to act as a group. Secondly, a relatively large proportion of the residents have to feel that their well being is significantly affected by the fate of the collectivity involved.

Some specific indicators follow:

1. Perception of Locality as Collectivity*

Measures of the extent to which residents in a particular residential locality see their fellow residents as members of a collectivity, relatively distinct from members of other localities.

a. Existence of place names over which there is consensus among residents as applying to the locality.

b. Recognition that residents are different in some critical respect from residents of other localities.

c. Use of place names as terms of self-description; extent to

---

*Operational forms of these variables depend very heavily on the existence of place names for the localities involved. Hence the critical first question is whether there is some degree of consensus among residents over a common place name. This is particularly critical for areas which are not political subdivisions and therefore do not ordinarily have place names as part of post office addresses. For political subdivisions, b, c, and d above, become of critical importance.

which residents consider themselves, e.g., New Yorker, Chicagoans, Baltimoreans, etc.

d. Recognition of sharing with other residents of some significant set of interests, that their fates are tied together.

2. Affective Involvement in Residential Locality as Collectivity*

a. Feelings of pride in self-identification as a resident of the locality.

b. Depth of anticipation of sense of loss if resident were to move from locality.

c. Readiness to define fellow residents as potential friends, mates, persons with whom one should make common cause.

3. Interest and Involvement in Local Events**

---

*Some example of survey items which might tap these variables are as follows: "How proud are you to be a (Chicagoan, etc.)? Very proud, Somewhat proud, Indifferent, ...etc." "Suppose for some reason or other you had to move from (locality). Assuming that you would not suffer economically from the move, how sorry would you be about moving from (locality)?" "Compared to people from other places, do you think it more likely, less likely, or doesn't make any difference that someone in (locality) would make the sort of friend you would want to have?" See Marc Fried, "Grieving for a Lost Home," in Leonard Duhl (ed.), The Urban Condition, New York, Basic Books, 1963, for a study of reactions of low income families upon being forced to relocate to other areas when their "slum" neighborhood was demolished in an urban renewal program.

**Morris Janowitz (The Community Press in an Urban Setting, The Free Press: Glencoe, 1952) presents the thesis that the local neighborhood weekly newspapers in Chicago help residents of those neighborhoods in defining the limits of their neighborhoods and in developing a sense of identification with those neighborhoods.

The measurement of attention paid to media of various types has been worked out very well by commercial social researchers intent on measuring the audiences of various media and media messages.

A number of social scientists have tried to work out measurements

a. Existence of locality oriented media, e.g., local newspapers, magazines, separate radio or TV stations, special sections or editions of metropolitan or regional media.

b. Existence of locality oriented and based voluntary associations, i.e., associations whose goals are to affect the course of events within the locality, e.g., political clubs, civic associations, neighborhood protective associations, etc.

c. Attention paid by individuals to local events as reported in mass media.

d. Membership in and participation in locality oriented voluntary associations.**

---

of what has become to be called "local-cosmopolitan" orientations. R. K. Merton ("Patterns of Influence" in P. F. Lazarsfeld and F. N. Stanton [eds.], Communications Research 1948-1949, Harper & Bros.: New York, 1949), found that he could classify persons regarded to be highly influential in a small New Jersey city according to whether they were oriented to local events (locals) or events occurring on the national or international scene (cosmopolitans). Although Merton did not develop an attitudinal scale devised to measure these orientations (indeed they were inferred mainly from the communications media exposure rates of individuals) several subsequent researchers attempted to do so, notably T. R. Dye, "The Local-Cosmopolitan Dimension and the Study of Urban Politics," Social Forces, 1966, 41, 3, and W. Dobriner, "Local and Cosmopolitan as Contemporary Suburban Types," in W. M. Dobriner (ed.), The Suburban Community, Putnam: New York, 1958. Although in these scales the attempt has been made to place "local" and "cosmopolitan" on opposite ends of the same continuum, it might make more sense to consider these not as polar concepts but as existing separately.

**This variable is discussed in greater detail in a later part of this chapter.

4. "Social Climate" Measures of Residential Localities

There are aspects of residential localities which are perceived by residents as establishing a sort of "social climate," general conditions of the locality generated by its social characteristics. Some of the more commonly expressed "climatalogical" factors are:

a. Friendliness of Locality: Extent to which other residents are seen as open to the formation of friendship.

b. Mutual Aid and Responsibility: Extent to which residents see each other as likely to help each other out in the event of need, e.g., borrowing small items, looking in on a neighbor to see if he is well, and so on.

c. Sense of Personal Safety: Extent to which the residents see themselves as free to travel through the locality without fear of robbery or assault, safety of possessions in one's house or on the grounds of the homesite, etc.

d. Tolerant-Intolerant: Extent to which residents see each other as accepting of a wide range of personal behavior or as disapproving of behavior that is outside a narrow range.

5. Residential Localities as Reference Groups*

Although "reference group" is one of the social psychologist's favorite ideas, it is not at all clear that great success has been experienced in giving the concept operational defintion. In essence, the concept of reference group is designed to cover those individuals, groups, or social categories with which an individual compares himself in order to establish a conception of his relative standing with respect to some evaluative dimension. Thus, in order for an individual to establish whether he is well off or not, e.g., with respect to his ability to use standard English, he has to have some sort of standard

---

*A collection of examples of how researchers have employed the concept of reference group in empirical research is contained in H. Hyman and E. Singer, Readings in Reference Group Theory and Research, The Free Press, New York, 1968. No examples are given, however, of the use of community, neighborhood or other types of residential localities as reference groups.

The present author (Rossi, op. cit.) used correlations between residents own class identifications and the imputed class placement of other residents in their neighborhoods as measures of the extent to which the residents in each of four Census tracts in Philadelphia identified with their fellow residents. The correlation coefficients for each census tract were used to characterize the tract according to the extent to which residents identified with each other in a social class sense. The higher the correlation the more stable were the residents in the tract.

Social class identification has been measured in a number of ways ranging from presenting the respondent with a set of fixed class names from among which to choose essentially patterned along the lines of R. Centers (The Psychology of Social Class, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1949) to the relatively open-minded method employed by W. Lloyd Warner (Social Class in America, Science Research Associates, Chicago, 1949).

against which he compares himself, e.g., TV announcers.

In this connection, the concept of reference group raises the question whether residential localities define significant reference groups for their residents. It is not at all clear whether the use of reference group in this sense is a measure of the solidarity or a measure of the lack of cohesion of a residential locality. One may argue that if the residents compare themselves with each other, they are showing the extent to which the locality is important to them and hence represents a positive bond. The opposite argument is that in localities whose residents are continually making invidious comparisons among themselves, the resulting status competition reduces solidarity. In either event, it is clear that whether or not a locality is a reference group to its inhabitants measures at least the salience of the locality.

These considerations suggest that it would be important to distinguish among the following states:

> Residential Localities as <u>Positive Reference Groups</u>: The extent to which residents see the residents of an area positively as persons they would like to be similar to or are in fact similar to.
>
> Residential Localities as <u>Negative Reference Groups</u>: The extent to which residents aspire to be different from or surpass other residents in the locality.

Thus it should make quite a difference if the residents in an area say that they are very much like each in social class and that furthermore they like this equality as compared with a situation in which they do not like the fact that they are like their neighbors.

There are many wasy in which residents of a locality can compare themselves with each other. The more important ways are listed below.

a. Socio-economic status:

(1) Residential localities as reference groups in social class placement (e.g., of which social class residents think they are members).

(2) Reference groups with regard to economic well being (e.g., how well off the residents think they are).

b. Race and ethnicity: Extent to which residents see themselves as members of the same race and/or ethnic groups.*

c. Life cycle stage: Extent to which residents see each other as the same or different with respect to age, family status,

---

*Despite the considerable attention American sociologists have given to ethnicity, it is difficult to find a large number of empirical studies of either ethnic self-identification or the importance of such identifications in important areas of behavior and activity. See Andrew M. Greeley, Why Can't They Be Like Us?, American Jewish Committee, New York, 1969, for a review of studies of ethnicity. For a good review of the general problem of ethnicity see Milton M. Gordon, Assimilation in American Life, Oxford University Press, New York, 1964. Perhaps the best known of studies of contemporary ethnic groups is Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan, Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Italians, Jews and Irish of New York City. MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachussetts, 1963.

household composition, etc.*

d. Other comparative judgements: Residential locality as reference group with respect to other areas of life--health, job, satisfcation, progress of children in school, and so on. Almost any area of life satisfaction might be used in this connection, even though some may appear to be very remote from residential considerations.

It can be anticipated that residential localities would serve as significant references groups to their residents in life areas which are closely related to activities that go on either within a household or within the area itself. Thus we can anticipate that for young children, the "neighborhood" is more important in a number of respects than the larger political subdivision. We can also anticipate that the residential locality will serve as an important reference group with respect to consumer goods: in "keeping up with the Joneses," the Joneses are supposed to be living nearby.**

6. Segmental Solidarity: Intra-Locality Differences and Conflict

Even in the most homogeneous housing areas, such as mass pro-

---

*Some attention has been given to life cycle homogeneity of residential localities particularly in connection with planning retirement communities. Here the question has been whether retired persons would be more satisfied to live in communities composed of retired persons or in communities with a more heterogeneous life cycle composition. See Irving Rosow, The Social Integration of the Aged, The Free Press of Glencoe, 1967, New York. Studies of other life cycle stages, e.g., young childless couples, are less frequently encountered.

**W. H. Whyte, The Organization Man, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1956.

duced tract housing or public housing, it can be anticipated that residents will see some degree of heterogeneity among their fellow residents. Especially where residential localities are also political subdivisions, perceived lines of cleavage ranging from the neutral perception of differences to preparations for armed conflict can be expected to exist. Indeed, the lines of cleavage, expressing segmental solidarity, may in many cases exceed in strength the sense of total solidarity for most residential localities of any appreciable size.

Although in principle any population characteristic that is relatively visible and marks off a sizable group of individuals or households could serve as a fault line along which intra-locality cleavages could arise, in fact the lines of cleavage tend to be generated by the following intra-locality differences:*

Socio-economic: income, formal education, and related characteristics, including housing style and price

Ethnic, racial, and religious

Life cycle stages: differences among residents according to age, composition of household, and accompanying demands for

---

*J. S. Coleman, Community Conflict, The Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., 1957. R. L. Crain, E. Katz and D. B. Rosenthal, The Fluoridation Decision, Bobbs-Merrill, Indianapolis, 1968. W. A. Gamson, "Rancorous Conflict in Community Politics," in T. N. Clark (ed.), Community Structure and Decision Making, Chandler, San Francisco, 1968. K. Underwood, Protestant and Catholic, Beacon Press, Boston, 1957. The above are but a few of the references to a very large literature on conflicts that have arisen within politically defined residential localities. They are presented here as examples of the kinds of studies which have been made and which illustrate the variety of intra-locality differences which have formed the basis of conflict.

different mixes of local services.

Time of arrival: cleavages among "newcomers" and "oldtimers"

These characteristics are ordinarily not independent of each other and hence tend to reinforce the perception of intra-locality differences and enhance the possibility of conflict being generated along such lines. Thus, because housing in a subarea tends to be relatively homogeneous in price, socio-economic differences tend to be structured along subareal lines. Similarly, racial groups tend to be relatively homogeneous internally with respect to religion, socio-economic level and sometimes with respect to life cycle and time of arrival.

In the present historical context the major fault line in our large metropolitan areas is that of race. Blacks and whites in many localities are vying for political power, with the mayor's office often being the focus of political contest. Indeed, some writers* have seen the relations between whites and blacks as the major problem of our major metropolitan areas.

There are two directions in which indicators of differences and cleavages may go. On the one hand, one might be concerned with the extent to which socio-economic levels coincide with differences in political loyalties or with opinions on particular issues. Thus, employing this approach a residential locality is characterized by relatively

---

*M. Grodzins, The Metropolitan Area as a Racial Problem, University of Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh, 1958. C. E. Silberman, Crisis in Black and White, Random House, New York, 1964.

high segmental solidarity if the correlations are high between the lines of cleavage and measures of attitudes on relevant issues. For example, if there is a stronger correlation between race and voting in a mayoralty election in Cleveland compared with Los Angeles, then the former city is characterized as having higher segmental solidarity than the latter.

On the other hand, one may proceed to study the extent to which potential fault lines are perceived as lines of cleavage. Thus, one would ask residents of a locality whether they perceive blacks and whites as essentially in agreement or in disagreement on relevant issues.

These two modes of approaching the operational definition of intra-locality cleavage are not mutually exclusive and indeed both directions may be pursued in the development of social psychological indicators. Because the mode of perceived differences is somehow more social psychological, it will be elaborated here:

a. Social distance:* Among the earliest attempts (circa 1925) to develop social psychological measures was Bogardus', "Social Distance Scale." Variations and refinements on his original

---

*E. S. Bogardus, Immigration and Race Attitudes, New York, Heath, 1928. Adaptations of the original scale have been used by M. I. Schwartz, Trends in White Attitudes Towards Negroes, National Opinion Research Center, Chicago, 1967 and by E. O. Laumann, Prestige and Association in an Urban Community, Bobbs-Merrill, Indianapolis, 1966, in a study of social distance among occupational levels.

measures have been used to measure the extent to which individuals would admit various ethnic groups into varying degrees of intimacy, ranging from marrying to allowing into the country as an immigrant. Adaptations of this scale have been used to establish trends in inter-group relations and in measuring the perceived distances among socio-economic groups.

The application suggested here is to establish the extent to which groups in a residential locality would admit members of other groups into different levels of intimacy.

b. Perceived group cleavages: Measures of the extent to which the various groups in the community are seen as agreeing or disagreeing on a variety of issues.*

7. Attachment to Residential Locality: Residential Mobility and Migration

One might suppose that the ultimate test of the solidarity of a

---

*For an example of one way of measuring such perceived differences see P. H. Rossi, et al., "Between White and Black," in National Commission on Civil Disorders, Supplemental Studies, GPO, Washington, 1968. An abortive attempt was made in the period immediately following World War II to develop tension indices for the state of race relations either in neighborhoods or among larger politically defined subdivisions. For a suggested neighborhood set of measures see S. A. Star, "An Approach to the Measurement of Interracial Tension," in E. W. Burgess and D. J. Bogue (eds.), Contributions to Urban Sociology, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1964. A rather elaborate attempt to measure roughly the same phenomena on a cross community basis was made by a group of researchers at Cornell University, reported in Robin Williams, Strangers Next Door, Prentice Hall, New York, 1964. Some ingenious suggestions for the measurement of inter-group tensions through unobtrusive measures have been suggested by Webb, et al., op. cit.

residential locality would be the rates of turnover of residents, an index which would seem to measure the extent to which residents are attached to their locality. Indeed, such measures are easily generated--e.g., counting the proportion of billing changes in public utility household accounts for an area--and it is relatively easy to construct reliable measures of potential for moving using survey interviews with household members.

Yet it would be an error to use mobility or migration rates as a direct measure of attachment to an area. Many moves are occassioned by events which are beyond the control of individuals or households (e.g., the destruction of a dwelling unit through fire or conversion to other use or because death has broken the primary household marital bond). Many moves are really actions which are necessary consequences of other decisions which an individual or household has made, as for example, in the case of new household formation or through the voluntary dissolution of a household in separation or divorce. Still other moves are the side-effects of labor market decisions: the most migratory of all occupational groups are young persons in the professions and technical occupations whose jobs are ordinarily sought on a national or regional labor market. Thus, for an engineer to seek a position means often enough that he must also consider moving. The migratory middle manager in large business enterprises or aspiring young assistant professors are other examples of occupational groups whose labor market decisions imply often enough long distance moves.

One of the more important sources of short distance moves lies in the shifting housing needs of households accompanying increases or decreases in household size. Thus, the birth of children or their subsequent marriage and removal from the household can radically alter the housing needs of a household and produce a strong desire to move on those grounds alone.

Indeed, the proper measure of attachment to a locality would be some indicator of "what it would take" in the way of income, cramped living quarters, etc., in order to produce a decision to move from a locality. Thus low levels of residents' attachements to locality might be measured by the extent to which residential mobility is highly sensitive to shifts in household composition. Or, how much an increment in income would make it attractive to an individual to consider migrating from a place to another.

Comparisons across localities in migration or mobility rates should be undertaken with some caution keeping in mind that both rates are sensitive to differences in life cycle and socio-economic compositions of localities as well as residents' attachments to the areas in question.* Hence residential turnover rates are only partially a re-

---

*John B. Lansing and Eva Mueller, The Geographic Mobility of Labor, Institute for Social Research, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1967, and Peter H. Rossi, Why Families Move, The Free Press, Glencoe, 1955.

flection of attachment to a locality and can be used as an indicator of attachment only when corrected for life cycle and socio-economic composition differences among areas.

The measurement of residential turnover can be accomplished fairly easily. To begin with, decennial Censuses routinely collect information of whether residents were living in the dwelling unit a year previous. Current population surveys also ask the same information routinely once a year and can provide a breakdown for large political subdivisions (e.g., major metropolitan areas). Turnover measures can sometimes be assembled through city directories, voter registration lists, and records of utilities companies. The measures suggested relate to past turnover and tend to overestimate turnover in areas in which there is new construction or extensive demolition of dwelling units.

Prospective measures of anticipated residential turnover can be constructed using sample survey data. Several studies* have shown that mobility intentions are rather good indicators of future behavior, sufficiently predictive to be used as forecasts of future turnover rates for localities.

---

*Peter H. Rossi, op. cit. The measures used have been simply to ask whether the household has any intention to move, what steps have been taken to search for an alternative dwelling unit, etc.

The measures suggested below all assume some sort of standardization for life cycle and socio-economic composition:

a. Past mobility rates: Census measures, directory turnover, etc.

b. Prospective mobility rates: Based on reported intentions of moving.

c. Measurement of incentives necessary to induce movement: Essentially measures of how much in the way of better housing, additional income, reduced housing costs, etc., it would take to induce moving intentions on the part of locality residents.

B. Interaction and Exchange: The Measurement of Integration

The integration of a residential locality has been defined earlier as the extent to which the residents of that locality have developed relatively enduring relationships in either formal or informal organizational contexts. Residential localities with dense networks of friendship in this sense are more integrated than those whose friendship networks cover sparsely the area in question. Similarly residential localities in which most of the residents concentrate in the locality do their buying of goods, selling of labor or services, procuring essential services, and so on are more integrated than those which do not.

The variables listed in this subsection are designed to measure integration in this sense. The variables lend themselves to two broad types of measures, as follows:

Absolute density measures: Extent to which social relationships of a given type cover an area, e.g., the average number of relatives of residents living in the locality in question.

Relative concentration measures: Proportion of all relationships of a given type that are with other residents of the locality in question, e.g., the proportion of all relatives of residents in an area who live in that area.

Although absolute density measures would seem to come closer to the general concept of integration, indicating the extent to which a locality is covered by relationships of a given type, such measures are affected by the extent to which persons enter into such relationships

regardless of the locations of the partners in the relationship. Thus, membership in voluntary organizations of all sorts tends to vary positively with socio-economic level.* Thus a locality may be classified as having a dense network of voluntary associations not because memberships of the residents are especially clustered in the area but because upper middle class residents tend to join more organizations. If attention is to be centered especially on the extent to which residents' activities are centered in the locality, the relative density measures are to be preferred.

Obviously, whether the one form or the other is to be used in a particular research in large part depends upon the purposes of the research and in part upon whether or not there are real differences between the alternative definitions in practice. It may well turn out that the rank orderings of localities are not substantially changed by shifting from one definition to another.

Listed below are the main forms of integrative ties which researchers might profitably employ:

1. Market Relationships

Measures of the extent to which the procurement of goods and services (including labor) are concentrated within residential local-

---

*M. Hausknecht, The Joiners, Bedminster Press, New York, 1962. See also D. P. Foley, "The Use of Local Facilities in a Metropolis," in J. P. Gibbs (ed.), Urban Research Methods, Van Nostrand, New York, 1961.

ities.

a. Individual employment: Measures of the extent to which the jobs held by residents are at places within the locality in question.

b. Firm employment: Measures of the extent to which firms within the locality draw upon the locality for their labor forces.

c. Small purchase consumer goods: Local purchases of low priced items, e.g., gasoline, food articles, drugs, newspapers, etc.

d. Major purchase consumer goods: Local purchases of high priced articles, appliances, automobiles, furniture, jewelry.

e. Professional services: Medical, legal, and other professional services.

f. Other services: Repairs to appliances, goods, cleaning services, etc.

The variables listed above have been primarily concerned with the market relationships involving individuals. A similar classification could be centered around relationships among firms, mercantile establishments, and other types of economic organizations. Indeed, a functionally autonomous residential locality has been defined as one in which the vast bulk of the market relationships involving individuals and firms are among persons and firms located within the boundaries of the unit.*

---

*T. N. Clark, "Community or Communities," in T. N. Clark (ed.), op. cit.

2. Voluntary Formal Associations

This form of social organization in which individuals join together for special purposes without explicit monetary return (i.e., almost all members are not employees) has been touched upon earlier in the form of voluntary associations which are community oriented in their goals. Voluntary associations can have a very wide range of goals from revolution to philately, providing a context in which individuals and households can be in close contact with one another and hence contribute to the exchange of interaction in a residential locality.

A classification of voluntary associations that will be useful for a wide variety of purposes and acceptable to all social researchers has yet to be worked out. The one listed below is designed to be particularly relevant for the study of residential localities:

a. Professional associations and unions: Associations designed to protect and advance the interests of a particular occupational group, including bargaining with employers and other users of services offered by the occupation. Sometimes borders on the "involuntary" as when membership in a union is required for all workers on particular levels in a plant or when access to important facilities (e.g., hospital privileges for doctors) is contingent on membership.

b. Religious associations: Churches, chapels, fellowships and the like, voluntary associations whose purpose it is to express solidarity with others professing the same views concerning

God and the Universe.

c. Political and para-political associations: Political clubs, political parties, civic associations, and so on, voluntary associations whose major goal it is to propose and elect public officials, and/or influence the course of decision making in a political jurisdiction.

d. Restricted purpose "leisure" activity associations: Country clubs, bowling clubs, etc. Voluntary associations whose purpose it is to indulge in a restricted band of non-work connected, non-political, and non-religious activities.

e. Other voluntary associations: Associations not covered in the classification proposed above.

The classification offered above has been phrased in terms of the major purposes of voluntary associations. It should be borne in mind that every voluntary association whatever its expressed purposes may be also fulfills other needs for its members. Thus a political club designed to influence the selection of candidates for political office also serves the sociability needs of its members and the country club can also be the scene in which major political transactions take place.

3. Kinship Relationships

The American kinship system is a simple and loose one as far as the total range of kinship systems that men have invented. We recognize descent in two lines, one stemming from the maternal and the other from

the paternal line. Newly formed nuclear families are supposed to set themselves up in separate households and most do so within a year or two of marriage. Our legal system prescribes strong financial and legal responsibilities of parents toward minor children and some states require children to provide financial support for their parents in the case of the latters' disability. We also permit divorce and have moved in the past few decades to make the obtaining of divorces somewhat easier.

However, beyond this very general outline the system appears to be vague and variable. The reciprocal obligations of spouses and parents and children have been spelled out in some detail in domestic law but the obligations among kin of different degrees of relationship have not been elaborated either in custom or in law. Thus whether one owes any obligations (say, visits) to one's second cousin is not clear, nor is it clear whether one's mother's brother's wife is a relative at all. It is clear that the primary kinship ties are within the two nuclear families to which the individual belongs at one time or another in his life: ties to his parents, his siblings, and his children. Other degrees of kinship are more or less optional ties.*

Despite the loose cultural definition of kin, kinship ties are

---

*A more detailed description of the American kinship system and an empirical study of kinship ties among whites in Greensboro, N. C., is contained in Bert N. Adams, Kinship in an Urban Setting, Markham Publishing Co., Chicago, 1968.

still of considerable importance. For example, social researchers in the Bell Telephone System estimate that the most frequent private telephone calls are between kin, with mother-daughter telephone calls probably the most frequent of all.

Ties of kinship could conceivably produce a considerable set of strong bonds among the residents of a residential locality if such residents are composed of sets of kin who recognize kinship as imposing mutual obligations. In this connection, we would be concerned with two main variables.

a. Density of kin relationships within residential locality: The extent to which residents in the locality have persons they recognize as relatives living in the area.

b. Viability of kinship relationships: Extent to which kinship ties imply communication, visiting, participation in ritual occasions (marriage, funerals, confirmations, christenings, etc.) and mutual aid obligations.

4. Friendship

If, in our culture, we judge that kinship is vaguely defined, then how should we judge the clarity of our conceptions of friendship? The term stretches to cover a range of intimacy from the exchange of greetings on chance meetings to the sharing of the most private thoughts and wishes. The English language and its vernacular versions contains only a few terms to designate degrees of friendship and virtually no terms to designate friendships of different sorts, i.e., cross-sex as opposed

to same-sex friendships, friendships of longstanding from those of relatively recent duration, friendships between age and status peers as opposed to those which span a generation or different social statuses, and so on.

Despite the ambiguity of the term, the phenomena covered by our loose concept of friendship is of considerable importance to residential localities.* We judge communities according to their friendliness, meaning that localities vary according to the ease with which it is possible to establish friendship ties with residents. A locality with dense friendship networks may be expected to be more likely to have a rich and varied set of voluntary associations.

Friendship ties lend themselves to very complicated measurement possibilities. The very notion of network involves connections among more than pairs of individuals, possibly in the form of cliques or other groupings. Hence communities can be characterized not only by how probable it is that any two individuals will form friendship ties but also by the extensiveness of ties among larger numbers of individuals, the extent to which such groupings are themselves connected to each other, and so on. It seems doubtful, however, that one would be concerned in the present connection with more than the crudest measures

---

*Joel Smith, William H. Form, and Gregory P. Stone, "Local Intimacy in a Middle-Sized City," American Journal of Sociology, 60 (1954), pp. 270-284.

of levels of friendship formation in residential localities, leaving to rather specialized studies the graphing and mapping of more complicated networks of such ties. For present purposes then, the measuring problem can stop at the point of calculating the probabilities that friendship ties of various sorts will be formed between pairs of residents.

Following common usage we can distinguish among three different levels of friendship.*

a. Persons "Known": The average number of persons that residents in a residential locality recognize by face and name.

b. Acquaintances: The average number of persons with whom residents have had some communication, and whose addresses or other regular spatial locations is known (e.g., place of work).

c. Friendship: The average number of persons with whom residents share some degree of intimacy, e.g., receive visits from, know about details of personal life, etc.

---

*Mark Granovetter (Johns Hopkins University) suggested the strength of such friendship (and kinship) ties be measured using as indices the time spent in the relationship, the emotional intensity of the tie and the amount of mutual confiding. The categories listed above are more or less close to common usage in which Granovetter's suggested measures are involved to some unknown and possible variable degree. Obviously, if one were to make an intense investment in measuring friendship and kinship ties, one would want to go in the directions suggested by Granvetter. For a superficial but not necessarily irrelevant approach, the categories suggested above are probably sufficient.

These averages are obviously strongly affected by the size of the population in a residential locality. Thus the number of unique pairs of individuals that can be formed out of a population of size N is $\frac{N(N-1)}{2}$, a figure which soon reaches astronomical proportions even in relatively small sized communities. Perhaps a more realistic way to compare localities is to consider the average number of local residents, with whom individual residents have friendship relations. Furthermore, as indicated earlier, one may distinguish between the absolute level of friendship relationships in a locality (i.e., the average number of friendships entered into by individual residents) and the relative concentration of friendships in the locality, the proportion of all friendships entered into by residents which are with other residents. This last measure may be regarded as one which indicates the relative importance of the residential locality as a source of frienships for its members.

C. Relationships to Central Local Institutions

A central local institution is an institution which is recognized in law or custom as having the right to act on behalf of the locality and/or to regulate the behavior of other institutions and individuals in the locality. In this sense, all politically autonomous localities by definition have central local institutions, a set of social positions with the powers to make decisions within constitutional limitations which are binding upon the residents of the locality. Politically dependent localities may also have institutions which act in political ways on behalf of the locality--for example, the local press and mass media, neighborhood improvement associations, civic clubs, political party clubs, and the like.

Such institutions are central in two important senses: first of all, the existence of such institutions serves an important symbolic function, providing the residents with a focus for their feelings about the locality as a collectivity. Thus, in an important sense a mayor represents his city vis a vis the rest of the society; it is the mayor who tenders the key to the city to visiting dignitaries. Secondly, these central institutions are important sources of critical services and amenities to residents--police protection, street maintenance, elementary and secondary education and the like.

One of the critical questions one may ask about a residential locality is whether there exists in the minds of residents institutions which are central in the sense of being viewed as representing the lo-

cality as a whole. Of course, for politically autonomous units, the question may turn out to be trivial if most residents view the mayor and other major public officials as serving that function for them. But for politically dependent units, this may turn out to be of critical importance in determining whether or not the locality is seen to be a collectivity.*

What are the institutions which typically can serve as central local institutions? The list which follows contains some of the more frequently cited "community" institutions.

Decision Making Institutions

1. Politically Defined Decision Making Institutions: Mayor, City Council, Commission, School Board, other major public officials.

2. Locality Oriented Voluntary Associations: Associations whose avowed goals are to act on behalf of the locality and in the "public interest": Civic Associations, Improvement Associations, Political Clubs, Chamber of Commerce, etc.

3. Local Media: newspapers, radio TV, magazines.

---

*Thus in a Chicago neighborhood, Hyde Park-Kenwood, the critical appearance of a para-political association, the Hyde Park-Kenwood Community Conference, which attempted to enlist as members all residents of the area and acted to represent the area in its attempts to obtain urban renewal assistance made it possible for the area's residents to act almost as a politically autonomous unit in obtaining special services from Chicago city government and special consideration from federal officials. See P. H. Rossi and R. Dentler, The Politics of Urban Renewal, The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1961.

Service Providing Institutions

4. Law Enforcement and Regulatory Agencies: Police, Courts, Health Department, Assessement Agency, Zoning Board, other licensing boards.
5. Elementary and Secondary Education.
6. Public and Quasi-Public Medical Services.
7. Other Local Government Services: Sanitation, water supply, street maintenance, public works, etc.

The first three categories in the above list may be viewed as those institutions in a locality which are either making binding decisions or attempting to influence the content of such decisions. These three together form the decision making machinery (although not the total group of decision makers) of a locality. The remaining categories may be viewed as institutions designed to provide essential collective services to the residents of a locality. Social psychological indicators concerned with the first sector are necessarily different from those directed at the second sector as the list below suggests:

1. Concerning the Decision Making Sector*

---

*Considerable research has been undertaken at least with respect to national political leaders that can be adapted to the decision making structures of local communities. See J. B. Robinson, J. G. Rusk, and K. B. Head, Measures of Political Attitudes, The Institute for Social Research, Ann Arbor, 1968, for a useful and comprehensive collection of attitudinal scales bearing on these areas.

a. Trust in Decision Makers: Extent to which residents feel that decision makers are making decisions with their best interests in mind.

b. Access: Extent to which residents feel that they have access to decision makers, are able to bring their views and ideas before them.

c. Efficacy: Extent to which residents feel that they can affect the outcome of decisions.

2. Concerning Services

a. Adequacy of Supply: Are there enough services being rendered? Do the police come when they are wanted? Are the schools overcrowded?

b. Quality of Supply: Are the services rendered efficient for the ends being served? Is public education of high quality? Police protection efficacious?

The measurement of attitudes towards services may be extended considerably beyond the brief outlines given above. For example, the activities of the police may be separated out into several types of services--emergency services rendered in the case of accidents, enforcement of traffic regulations, handling of suspected criminals, investigation of crime, relationship to criminals, crime prevention, etc. Similarly, the list of services provided by welfare departments, sanitation departments, etc., may be extended to cover all of those services rendered to individuals and households.

It should be borne in mind that the average ratings given by recipients to the services being rendered by the central institutions of a locality are only loosely related to the quantity of such services as judged by perhaps professional standards. For example, in a survey of Roman Catholics' attitudes towards their parochial schools, it was found that most parents were very satisfied with the schooling received by their children although at the same period of time Catholic periodicals were full of criticisms directed at the Catholic schools.* Similarly, national sample studies of Americans' attitudes toward public schools show them to be satisfied with public education with only a small minority feeling that the schools are not doing well in general or doing well with respect to their own children.**

Another critical issue in the understanding of the social psychology of "community" life is the relationship that can be found between consumer satisfaction with municipal services and the professional appraisal of such services. It may well be that for services which

---

*A. M. Greeley and P. H. Rossi, The Education of Catholic Americans, Aldine, Chicago, 1966.

**It may well be that because these studies have focussed on national samples that considerable school system to school system variation has been glossed over that is related to the quality of schools as judged by professional opinion. For example, in an unpublished study, H. Schuman finds that there is significant community to community variation in ratings of police treatment of citizens. He finds furthermore that blacks and whites tend to agree in their rating of police treatment. (H. Schuman, "City as an Explanatory Variable in the Study of Racial Attitudes," Institute for Social Research, September, 1969, [Mimeo].)

are rendered directly and which require apparently little professional expertise (e.g., police treatment of traffic offenders, removal of garbage and waste, maintenance of streets, etc.) both professional and lay opinions of services rendered would tend to coincide while for indirectservices (e.g., sewage treatment) or highly professional services (medical care) expert judgements and popular appraisals would tend to diverge.

D. Social Psychological Aspects of Housing

At the heart of the concept of a residential locality is that one of its main functions is to provide residences for its inhabitants. We spend more time in our homes than in any other place and even though a good proportion of that time is spent in sleeping, some of the more important human activities are carried on there. We eat in our homes, make love, raise children, talk intimately with our families and friends, and do most of our non-work reading, listening, and viewing. The house is a many-purposed envelope surrounding the space in which much that is the heart of human activity is carried out. For minor children and housewives, the home looms even larger in importance as a locale for activity.

Stressing the importance of the home in the lives of its inhabitants may be belaboring the obvious to the reader. Yet these "obvious" statements are easy to lose sight of in the study of residential localities. Their implications are that the main reason why individuals and households are residents is because of the housing involved. In a study of "communities" and the attachments individuals and households have to residential localities, it is easy to stress the non-housing aspects at the expense of paying attention to housing as a major factor in forming the social characteristics of such areas.

Despite the importance of the housing industry to our economy and the importance of the house to the daily lives of humans, remarkably little research has been devoted to either the housing choice behavior of individuals or to the impact of housing on people. In large part

this lack of research stems from the structural characteristics of the housing industry: there are few large producers, most of the market transactions in housing is not in new housing units but in the sale or rental of old units, and housing is remarkably unstandardized. In short, competition on the housing market is not among large industrial firms producing branded products but among households attempting to sell one unit and small firms attempting to sell or rent a very small (compared to total market) proportion of housing units.

As for research on the impact of housing upon individuals and households, the house turns out to be such a complicated bundle of factors that it has proven almost impossible to discern any appreciable effect of housing.* People have shown themselves to be remarkably able to adjust to the particular features of a dwelling so as to minimize the impact which such features may have upon their lives.

This is not to say that housing is unimportant to individuals or households--the experience of everyday existence would belie such a statement. It is merely to state that the importance of housing does not lie in the way in which homes shape the lives of the people who inhabit them. Housing is an important source of gratification: a home

---

*Perhaps the most careful of all studies in this area was conducted by D. Wilner, et al., (The Housing Environment and Family Life, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, 1962) in which a sample of families entering public housing was compared with a set of families who had applied for such housing but for one reason or another were not admitted. The two sets of families were studied over a number of years, only to find that the end differences between the two groups were minimal.

may provide aesthetic pleasure or offend one's aesthetic sensibilities; it may make it easy to prepare and serve meals, provide enough heat in the winter or be uncomfortable; provide enough privacy for solitary activities or make it hard to do anything alone, and so on. Individuals and households choose their housing from among the alternatives of which they know and within the price ranges they can afford with a view towards maximizing those aspects which are important to them.* However, whether or not their choices enable them to maximize the desirable enabling characteristics of their housing, people have shown themselves to be remarkably flexible in adapting to their housing environments.

It is easy to overemphasize the importance of non-housing factors in the locational choices of households. A great deal has been made of the trend towards the suburbs in terms of the kinds of life styles that households are seeking in making such choices. The cry arises that our cities are being deserted, that the middle class is running away from the dangerous central cities to seek a more tranquil existence in the suburbs, and so on. Yet the fact of the matter is that regardless of choice, given the increases in our population and the lack of land

---

N. N. Foote, et al., Housing Choices and Housing Constraints, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1960.

available for residential development within central cities, most of the expansion of the stock of housing had to occur in suburban areas. Furthermore, national policy toward aiding American families to purchase homes had made it financially less burdensome to "own" rather than rent.* Federal home mortgage policy has fostered the development of the suburbs and of the single family detached home. The development and continued expansion of the suburbs can be largely accounted for on the basis of housing choices in relation to the way in which the housing markets of metropolitan areas have been structured by public policy and the economics of the housing industry.

From the point of view of this chapter, the social psychological issues involved are those involved in establishing what are the housing preferences of different segments of the population and the roles played by such preferences in selecting a residential locality. One would also be interested in charting whatever changes in such preferences occur over time. Several alternative approaches to the measurement of such preferences suggest themselves, as follow§:

Housing behavior as the expression of preferences: This is an approach that seeks to understand housing preferences by

---

*In a study of mass produced tract housing in Levittown, Pennsylvania, Herbert J. Gans concludes (The Levittowners, Pantheon Press, New York, 1967) that the main motivation of the residents in locating in that community was to take advantage of what they saw to be a housing bargain. In short, Levittown offered more house for what they could afford than was available to them in alternative choices.

examining the characteristics of housing that is purchased (or rented) by households. Using this approach one would be mainly concerned with describing the characteristics of housing that is presently being occupied by households and using such characteristics as expressions of their preferences as mediated by their ability to indulge such preferences in the housing market.

Housing satisfactions and dissatisfactions as the expression of preferences: Under this approach one would be concerned with measuring the extent to which the housing occupied by households meets their needs and desires. Using this approach one would be concerned with measuring degrees of satisfaction with various aspects of housing occupied.

Housing choice behavior as the expression of preferences: This approach seeks to understand preferences by studying the choices made by households and individuals as they seek to purchase (or rent) housing. By contrasting the differences among alternatives actually considered and observing those housing characteristics which are present in the housing actually chosen and absent in those which were rejected, one could construct a schedule of preferences.

Direct measurement of preferences: This approach would ask households and individuals to state directly their preferences in housing characteristics. A variety of scaling techniques could be employed to develop a hierarchy of pre-

ferences in such characteristics for individual households and for aggregates of households.

The present author leans towards the measurement of satisfaction with housing as an indicator of housing preferences. Previous research has shown such measures to be strongly related to choices actually made in subsequent housing market behavior and to be highly predictive of whether households would move or not.*

The specific aspects of housing with which such social psychological indicators should be concerned are outlined below. For the present purposes we have made distinctions between housing as a "bundle of utilities" and housing as a location in social and physical space. Although these may be important analytical distinctions, in fact the characteristics of dwellings are closely related to their location and hence in the empirical world it is hard to separate out these dimensions.

1. Interior Characteristics of Dwelling Units

   a. Space: Volume of space and floor area in dwelling unit.

   b. Space Configurations: The most important aspect of interior space is the number of rooms into which the space is divided and the uses to which these rooms may be put. In this con-

---

*P. H. Rossi, Why Families Move, The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1955. Subsequent researches conducted in later periods when the housing market was not as tight or in other areas of the country have confirmed these findings. See, for example, Barrie B. Greenbie, "New House or New Neighborhood?" Land Economics, XLV, 3 August, 1969.

nection the number of bedrooms, the existence of a dining room, storage space, etc., are all important with the number of bedrooms being perhaps of overriding importance.

c. Heating and Cooling: Facilities for heating and cooling interior of dwelling unit. Here one would be concerned with the adequacy of the facilities and the ability of the dweller to control.

d. Food Preparation: Adequacy and convenience of facilities for preparation, storage and serving of food for meals.

e. Noise Insulation: Degree to which noise is transmitted through the dwelling unit.

f. Other Amenities: Light, air, adequacy of electrical supply, maintenance of multiple dwellings, etc.

2. Exterior Characteristics of Dwelling Unit

a. Space: Closeness to other dwellings.

b. Appearance of Exterior: Style of housing, maintenance of exterior.

3. Location in Physical Space

a. Location in reference to work: Travel time to work, cost of journey to work.

b. Location in reference to shopping.

c. Location in reference to other activities: recreation, cultural centers, schools.

d. Location in reference to significant others: Kin, friends, desirability of neighbors.

e. Other external physical features arising from location: Noise from other people, traffic; quality of air, physical appearance of neighborhood, etc.

4. Location in Social Space

Most of the elements that would be considered under this heading have been previously touched upon in this chapter. Here one would be concerned with the social meaning of the location, the social status indicated by the neighborhood, the kinds of sociability opportunities presented by neighbors, attachment to the locality as a collectivity, etc.

VI. A Strategy for Community Social Indicators

The purpose of a set of social indicators is to provide periodic readings of important and critical social trends. The choice of a particular set of indicators for a specific area of social life should be guided by a number of considerations, among which the following might be considered important: first, a set of social indicators should be based upon a model of how the area of social life in question "works"; secondly, the number of indicators ought to be small in number so that it becomes easy to observe trends; and thirdly, the indicators ought to be related to potential social policy.

Given these considerations, it should be immediately apparent to the reader that the catalogue of indicators presented in this paper do not fit any of the criteria listed above. To begin with, the model underlying the catalogue is scarcely to be dignified with that name. The indicators were chosen in an attempt to be exhaustive rather than in an attempt to pick the small number of critical indicators that existing theory indicates would be worthwhile. Finally, because social policy in the community area is not clearly defined, except with respect to the newest legislation of the War on Poverty, it is difficult to indicate which of the community characteristics would be most relevant to social policy.

The major obstacle to developing a model of residential localities which would enable one to pick and choose in a more decisive way the social indicators of prime interest lies in the all inclusive na-

ture of the phenomenon involved. After all, a residential locality is where we mainly live and hence the adequacy of the locality may be indexed in a wide variety of ways depending upon how strong a role one's implicit theory imputes to community effects. As yet, social scientists know too little to impute a reasonable degree of strength to community characteristics as conditions or as causes of any set of outcomes. Indeed, it is not at all clear which are outcomes and which are inputs among the characteristics listed in this paper.*

In the absence of such models that appear to be reasonable, it may be best to adopt a strategy which states that at minimum the residents of localities ought to be satisfied with what the localities in question provide to their residents. Hence, one might pare down the catalogue presented in this paper into the following set of satisfaction measures:

1. Satisfaction with Dwelling Unit: Space, interior amenities, exterior styling, cost.
2. Satisfaction with Access to Major Markets: Employment opportunities, retail outlets, transportation.
3. Satisfaction with Central Institutions of Locality: Local

---

*If one makes some crude assumptions it is possible to construct a model of some restricted phenomenon, as Jay Forester (Urban Dynamics, MIT Press, Cambridge, 1969) has done. However, most urban economists and sociologists would agree that there is very little reason to start with the basic model that Forester lays out and hence that his projected workings out of various social policies in the housing area are at best sterile exercises and at worst highly misleading.

government, public officials public and quasi-public services, etc.

4. Satisfaction with Sociability Opportunities: Friendliness of neighborhood, number of friends, number of kin in neighborhood, personal safety.
5. Satisfaction with Locality as Gratification: Pride in residence, positive attachment to fellow residents as reference groups, solidarity, desires, intentions, willingness to move.

While measures along the lines suggested above may provide one with a sense of whether our residential localities are satisfying their residents, they do not provide a good handle on why residents are satisfied or not. This means that research leading to a working model for residential localities will still have to be undertaken. We need to know, for example, whether sociability satisfactions are higher in life cycle homogeneous as opposed to heterogeneous neighborhoods, or whether communities which are integrated with respect to retail markets are more solidary than those which are not.

In short, while it may be possible to monitor how well our residential localities are doing in the eyes of their residents, it is still an open question as to the processes which generate satisfaction or its opposite.